

# Today and Tomorrow . . . By Walter Lippmann

## China and the U.N. *Post 11/11/65*

FOR THE FOURTH time in five years, the question whether Peking or Taipei will occupy the seats that belong to "China" is again before the United Nations. During these years there has been a striking change in the shape of the problem.



Lippmann

Sentiment has grown in most of the world in favor of seating Peking on the ground that mainland China really is "China" and that as a matter of practical politics it must participate in any peaceable settlement in East Asia. As this sentiment has grown the Peking government has stiffened the conditions which the U.N. must meet before it would accept the seats if they were offered.

If the Peking conditions are to be taken literally as being what, in his press conference on Sept. 29, Foreign Minister Chen Yi said they are, the debate may be regarded as over and the question disposed of. For the position of Peking would then be that it will not accept the seats unless the United Nations surrenders unconditionally, not only on Taiwan but on a radical revision of the Charter and on a purge, directed by Peking, of the membership of the United Nations. If all these conditions are to be regarded as not within the realm of accommodation and negotiation, then Mr. Chen Yi must be understood as having renounced Peking's entry into the U.N. He must be understood as preferring for ideological and other

reasons to continue to remain a hostile outsider.

IN CONSEQUENCE, our real problem is not how to keep Red China out of the U.N. Mr. Goldberg was in effect arguing a case which his Red Chinese opponents had already won for him. Polemics are not statesmanship, and our real problem and that of the great majority of the loyal supporters of the U.N. is how the abyss between Red China and the rest of mankind is to be bridged, how the alienation of the mainland Chinese is to be overcome, how China is to be brought into the universal society.

When we examine Chen Yi's conditions, I think we may suppose that all the talk about the revision of the Charter and the purge of the members is no more than a preview of what Red China would argue for if she were in the United Nations. The real pre-condition is the old one—that Peking must not only be given the seats in the U.N. organization now occupied by Taiwan but that Taiwan must also be expelled from the U.N. The United States cannot honorably agree to this demand or even tacitly assent to it. Not all countries are in honor bound as we are, but it is a virtual certainty that enough members will join us in refusing to deprive Taiwan—a state which has eleven million people in it—of representation in the United Nations. Those who will refuse to expel Taiwan will be enough, it appears, to deny the two-thirds vote it would take to expel Taiwan.

It is not certain that this deadlock over Taiwan will last forever, or even far beyond the lifetime of Chiang Kai-shek. The magnetic attraction of China on Taiwan

will be strong, and eventually a political deal reunifying the two Chinas is a distinct possibility.

Since that is only a future eventuality, the only hope in the near future for an agreed solution is for the United Nations to recognize Peking as "China" and to recognize Taiwan as "Taiwan." This is not precisely what has been called in the past "the two China" solution. For there would be only one "China." But the solution would recognize the independence of Taiwan which, as a matter of fact, has not been under the rule of the Chinese mainland since 1895. It would amount to treating Taiwan, which was conquered and colonized by the Chinese from Fukien in the 17th Century, as so many other former colonies, new independent members of the U.N., have been treated.

TO BACK the independence of Taiwan is to arouse the opposition not only of Peking but of Chiang Kai-shek as well. But in principle an independent Taiwan, neutralized under a United Nations guarantee, would be in the spirit of the age, and if in the end Peking were to accept it, it would not only solve the problem at the U.N., but it might well be a decisive step towards peaceable coexistence in Asia.

It is, of course, not easy to believe that such a rational and civilized accommodation will be reached. It requires an act of faith to make such a formula an objective of policy. But if there gather behind the idea the preponderant majority of the United Nations, we can at least say that no one who joins this majority will ever need to feel ashamed that he has done so.

© 1965, The Washington Post Co.